

STATE OF MAINE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. 1999-356

August 19, 1999

BELL ATLANTIC - MAINE
Request for Approval of
Resale Agreement with
UniDial LLC

ORDER APPROVING
RESALE AGREEMENT

WELCH, Chairman; NUGENT and DIAMOND, Commissioners

In this Order, we approve a resale agreement between New England Telephone and Telegraph Company d/b/a Bell Atlantic-Maine (Bell Atlantic) and UniDial Telecommunications, LLC (UniDial LLC), pursuant to section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

On January 6, 1998, in Docket No. 97-932, we approved a resale agreement between Bell Atlantic and Metracom Corporation. On May 28, 1999, Bell Atlantic filed an Amendment to Resale Agreements, negotiated between Bell Atlantic and UniDial LLC. That Amendment and Bell Atlantic's transmittal letter states that UniDial Telecommunications, LLC (UniDial LLC) is a successor in interest to Metracom, LLC (Metracom Corp.) The Amendment to Resale Agreements thus constitutes a resale agreement between Bell Atlantic and UniDial pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252, enacted by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. An agreement reached pursuant to that provision may allow a telecommunications carrier to purchase unbundled network elements, or local services at a discounted wholesale rate (the discount reflecting avoided cost), or both, from an incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) or competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC).

UniDial LLC will pay to Bell Atlantic the discounted prices contained in the voluntary agreement that was reached pursuant to arms-length negotiations between the parties. The pricing standards contained in 47 U.S.C. § 252(d) apply only to arbitration proceedings under section 252(b) and not to negotiated agreements under section 252(a). Bell Atlantic does not represent that the prices contained in the Agreement are consistent with the section 252(d) pricing standards or with any other state or federal policy.

Section 252(e)(2) states that a state commission may reject a negotiated agreement only if it finds that "the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement" or if "the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity." We received no comments by the comment deadline set in a July 13, 1999 Notice of Agreement and Opportunity to Comment. We do not make either of the

findings set forth in section 252(e)(2) for rejection, and we therefore approve the agreement.

We qualify our approval in two respects, however, and reserve findings on future potential issues. First, we reserve judgment on whether the rates contained in the agreement are reasonable from the perspective of Bell Atlantic's retail ratepayers. Bell Atlantic is presently under an alternative form of regulation (AFOR) ordered by the Commission in Docket No. 94-123. The AFOR began in December 1995. Under the AFOR, Bell Atlantic bears the risk of lost revenues resulting from rates that are too low. However, at the end of the initial 5-year period of the AFOR, and in 2005 if the present AFOR is renewed, we may have occasion to review Bell Atlantic's earnings. We do not resolve whether Bell Atlantic is receiving reasonable compensation from any CLECs that may avail themselves of the rates provided to UniDial LLC pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(i) and, if they are not reasonable, whether we should impute revenues to Bell Atlantic.

Second, section 271(c) of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 271(c), requires that the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs) meet certain requirements before they are allowed to provide interLATA service (the so-called "competitive checklist"). Under section 271(d)(3), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) must determine whether the BOC has met the competitive checklist before granting the BOC authority to provide interLATA service within its region. Prior to making that determination, the FCC must consult with state commissions "in order to verify the compliance of the BOC with the checklist." Our approval of this Agreement should not be construed as a finding that Bell Atlantic has met those requirements.

The agreement filed by Bell Atlantic provides for resale of Bell Atlantic's services in Maine by UniDial LLC. If UniDial LLC seeks to interconnect with networks maintained by independent local exchange carriers in Maine, or to resell services offered by those carriers, it must seek a termination, suspension, or modification of the exemption contained in 47 U.S.C. § 251(f)(1)(A).

ORDERING PARAGRAPHS

Accordingly, we

1. Approve the Amendment to Resale Agreements between New England Telephone and Telegraph Company d/b/a Bell Atlantic-Maine and UniDial Telecommunications, LLC (UniDial LLC) attached hereto, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(e); and

2. Order that the Administrative Director shall make a copy of the attached Agreement available for public inspection and copying pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 252(h) within 10 days of the date of this Order.

Dated at Augusta, Maine this 19th day of August, 1999.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

Dennis L. Keschl
Administrative Director

COMMISSIONERS VOTING FOR: Welch
Nugent
Diamond

NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO REVIEW OR APPEAL

5 M.R.S.A. § 9061 requires the Public Utilities Commission to give each party to an adjudicatory proceeding written notice of the party's rights to review or appeal of its decision made at the conclusion of the adjudicatory proceeding. The methods of review or appeal of PUC decisions at the conclusion of an adjudicatory proceeding are as follows:

1. Reconsideration of the Commission's Order may be requested under Section 1004 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (65-407 C.M.R.110) within 20 days of the date of the Order by filing a petition with the Commission stating the grounds upon which reconsideration is sought.
2. Appeal of a final decision of the Commission may be taken to the Law Court by filing, within 30 days of the date of the Order, a Notice of Appeal with the Administrative Director of the Commission, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320 (1)-(4) and the Maine Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 73 et seq.
3. Additional court review of constitutional issues or issues involving the justness or reasonableness of rates may be had by the filing of an appeal with the Law Court, pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 1320 (5).

Note: The attachment of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the particular document may be subject to review or appeal. Similarly, the failure of the Commission to attach a copy of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the document is not subject to review or appeal.